

REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation Examiner's remarks in the August 9, 2007 in-person Interview acknowledging that the amendments as then written would overcome the previous rejections. Independent claims 1, 7, 9, 10, and 14 have been further amended in accordance with Examiner's suggestions to clarify the claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above-mentioned interview and the following remarks. Claims 1-44 were pending prior to the Office Action. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-15 and 17-44 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10 and 14 are independent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter.

Applicants appreciate that the Examiner considers claims 19-20, 22-28 and 32 to include allowable subject matter.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 7, 8, 10, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Claims 8, 25, 29, 30, 34, 38 and 41 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being dependent from claim 7. Claims 27, 31, 36, 39 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being dependent from claim 10. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In response to Examiner's comments, claim 7 has been amended to recite "a plurality of third image signals different from each other" and claim 10 has been amended to recite "a plurality of second image signals different from each other". Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 9, 12, 14-16 and 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawamura et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,997; hereinafter “Kawamura”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Kawamura describes a still image recording apparatus for compressing and storing image information. The apparatus includes a compression unit for compressing the same image information at a plurality of different compression ratios. Also a memory is included for storing the image data compressed by the compression unit at different compression ratios.

However, Kawamura is not concerned with providing a method of image processing that generates a plurality of images which are different from each other in color balance, sharpness, gradation characteristics, brightness, edge enhancement and saturation. The present claimed invention provides performing image processing on a stored first image signal. Depending on the parameters of image processing, a multiple of second images signals are produced from the first image signal. In contrast, Kawamura is merely directed to producing images with different compression ratio values. Thus, Kawamura neither discloses nor suggests “performing a plurality of image processing on the stored first image signal, each of said plurality of image processing is performed according to parameters of image processing different from each other to produce the plurality of second image signals, wherein the parameters of image processing are selected from a group including gain, gradation control, luminance-chrominance, edge enhancement, and saturation emphasis” as recited in claim 9 of the present invention.

Independent claim 14 recites “wherein a combination of imaging parameters and values applied to generate each second image data is unique for each second image data among the plurality of second image data, the parameters of image processing selected from a group including gain, gradation control, luminance-chrominance, edge enhancement, and saturation emphasis”. As discussed with respect to claim 9 above, Kawamura is not concerned with providing a method of image processing that generates a plurality of images which are different

from each other in color balance, sharpness, gradation characteristics, brightness, edge enhancement and saturation. Thus, Kawamura neither teaches nor suggests at least the above-identified claim feature.

In view of the above remarks regarding claims 9 and 14 it is respectfully submitted that Kawamura does not anticipate the present claimed invention as claimed in claims 9 and 14. As claims 12, 15, 16, and 35 are dependent on independent claims 9 and 14 respectively, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12, 15, 16, and 35 are patentable for the same reasons as discussed above in regards to claims 9 and 14. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 9, 12, 14-16 and 35 under 35 USC 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara

Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 33 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura and in view of Ishihara (U.S. Patent No. 6,091,513; hereinafter “Ishihara”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ishihara is directed toward an apparatus and method for converting image size and recording medium recording the image size converting program. Figure 6 illustrates a functional block diagram of the image size converting process disclosed in Ishihara. The flow chart for the image size converting process is illustrated in Figures 7A and 7B.

However, similarly to Kawamura, Ishihara is not concerned with providing image signal processors each generating one of a plurality of images which are different from each other in color balance, sharpness, gradation characteristics, brightness, edge enhancement and saturation. The present claimed invention provides for performing image processing on a stored first image signal. Depending on the types and parameters of image processing, a multiple of second images signals are produced from the first image signal. Ishihara, on the other hand, merely produces images with different image size. Thus, Ishihara, similarly to Kawamura, neither discloses nor suggests “wherein each of said plurality of image processors performs image processing on the

first image signal where each image processor performs a different type of processing from every other image processor, the type of processing being selected from a group consisting of a change of brightness, a change of gradation change characteristics, a correction of a color temperature, a change of saturation, a change of a contour, and a change of a black level of the first image signal stored in said first memory” as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

In view of the above amendments and remarks with respect to claims 1 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 14 are not made unpatentable by Kawamura and Ishihara when taken alone or in combination. As claims 2, 6, 11, 33 and 37 are dependent on claims 1 and 14 respectively, it is respectfully submitted that, in addition to the above remarks, these claims are also patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 14. It is thus further respectfully submitted that this rejection should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara, Boies

Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura, in view of Ishihara and further in view of Boies (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,732; hereinafter “Boies”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara, Moriya

Claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 29-31, 34, 36, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura, in view of Ishihara and further in view of Moriya (U.S. Patent No. 5,754,709; hereinafter “Moriya”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Boies

Claims 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura in view of Boies. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Moriya

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura, in view of Moriya. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara, Kotaki

Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura in view of Ishihara and further in view of Kotaki (U.S. Patent No. 5,337,152; hereinafter “Kotaki”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara, Moriya, Kotaki

Claims 41 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura and Ishihara in view of Moriya and further in view of Kotaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Kawamura, Ishihara, Kotaki

Claims 42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawamura in view of Ishihara and further in view of Kotaki. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Michael R. Cammarata, Reg. No. 39,491 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

#40,439

By

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant